

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Specification***

Applicants amendments to the specification dated 7/8/08 are approved.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jelinek et al. U.S. Patent 5,826,167 in view of U.S. Patent 7,346,917 B2 to Gatto et al.**

a. Regarding Claim 1, Jelinek et al. discloses a video system (column 4, lines 39-41), comprising:

a video source operable to transmit an active video signal on a transmission line (FIG. 2, element 30 and column 5, lines 55-59);

a plurality of video receivers (column 5, lines 59-61), each said receiver being operable to transmit a respective data signal on a respective one of a plurality of ports (column 5, line 67 through column 6, lines 1-2); and

a distribution device electrically connected to said transmission line and to each of said ports (column 6, lines 20-21), said distribution device being operable to transmit each of the data signals to said video source on said transmission line (column 9, lines 29-33), said distribution device including a plurality of amplifiers (column 5, lines 57-59), each said amplifier having an input and an output, each said amplifier being operable to receive signals on said input for transmission on said output as amplified signals (Although Jelinek is silent on specific functions of amplifiers, it is understood and expected that the amplifier(s) in Jelinek includes an input, output, and gain), each said amplifier being operable to block signals received on said output from being transmitted on said input (column 6, lines 56-61, Jelinek uses filters in conjunction with amplifiers to prevent forward signal from reaching reverse path), each said amplifier being operable to transmit a respective said amplified signal to a respective one of said receivers on a respective one of said ports (column 6, lines 19-26), each of the amplified signals being dependent upon the active video signal and upon a data signal from the receivers other than said respective receiver (column 6, lines 56-60. Examiner interprets data signal dependency to mean upstream data received at video source influences content of active video signal delivered to receivers).

Jelinek fails to teach that both the active video signal from the video source and a data signal from the other receivers are transmitted to the respective receiver via the same port.

Gatto discloses a home network (figure 2) with a number of set top boxes and client PCs utilizing Ethernet to connect to the internet as well as each other (column 7,

lines 4-20). Video and Internet data, and requests to view data (data signals from other devices) may be transmitted over the network from main STB 100 (column 7, lines 35-56). User may watch DVDs or recorded programming stored on one device in another room (column 7, lines 39-53).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Jelinek to utilize the home network features as taught by Gatto for the advantage of allowing users to watch programming on client devices without having to stand in front of the main STB with a remote control (column 7, lines 53-56).

b. Regarding Claim 2, Jelinek et al. discloses a system wherein the data signals transmitted by said receivers comprise upstream data signals (column 5, line 67 through column 6, lines 1-5 and column 6, lines 15-18), said video source being operable to transmit the active video signal and a downstream data signal (column 5, lines 55-57, and lines 61-63) on said transmission line (column 5, lines 55-59), each said amplified signal being dependent upon the active video signal, the downstream data signal, and an upstream data signal from a receiver other than said respective receiver (column 6, lines 56-60. Examiner interprets data signal dependency to mean upstream data received at video source influences content of active video signal delivered to receivers).

c. Regarding Claim 3, Jelinek et al. discloses a system wherein each said amplified signal is dependent upon the active video signal and upon each of the data signals from the receivers other than said respective receiver (column 6, lines 56-60. Examiner interprets data signal dependency to mean upstream data received at video source influences content of active video signal delivered to receivers).

d. Regarding Claim 4, Jelinek et al. discloses a system wherein each said amplifier comprises a one-way active device that transmits signals only on its output (column 4, lines 59-63).

e. Regarding Claim 5, Jelinek et al. discloses a distribution device includes bypass circuitry operable to transmit the data signals from each of the receivers to the transmission line and to the inputs of said amplifiers such that the data signals bypass said amplifiers (FIG. 4. Jelinek's invention is an implementation of a bypass system allowing upstream data signals to arrive at the video source).

f. Regarding Claim 6, Jelinek et al. discloses a system where bypass circuitry is operable to transmit the data signals from each of the receivers to the transmission line (column 6, lines 62-66) and to the inputs of all of said amplifiers not corresponding to said receiver from which said data signal originates (Examiner previously noted the presumption of the data signal from the respective receiver is sent upstream on the transmission line to the video source).

g. Regarding Claim 7, Jelinek et al. discloses a transmission line comprises a coaxial cable (column 6, lines 19-21 and FIG. 3, element 27).

h. Regarding Claim 8, it has been analyzed and rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of Claim 1 above and because the scope of the claim is similar.

i. Regarding Claim 9, all the limitations are captured in Claim 1, therefore Claim 9 has been analyzed and rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of Claim 1 above and because the scope of the claim is similar.

j. Regarding Claim 10, it has been analyzed and rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of Claim 2 above and because the scope of the claim is similar.

k. Regarding Claim 11, it has been analyzed and rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of Claim 3 above and because the scope of the claim is similar.

l. Regarding Claim 12, it has been analyzed and rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of Claim 4 above and because the scope of the claim is similar.

m. Regarding Claim 13, it has been analyzed and rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of Claim 5 above and because the scope of the claim is similar.

n. Regarding Claim 14, it has been analyzed and rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of Claim 6 above and because the scope of the claim is similar.

o. Regarding Claim 15, it has been analyzed and rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of Claim 7 above and because the scope of the claim is similar.

p. Regarding Claim 16, it has been analyzed and rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of Claim 1 and 8 above and because the scope of the claim is similar. In regards to bypass limitation, it has been analyzed and rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of Claim 6 above and because the scope of the claim is similar.

q. Regarding Claim 17, it has been analyzed and rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of Claim 6 above and because the scope of the claim is similar.

r. Regarding Claim 18, it has been analyzed and rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of Claim 1 above and because the scope of the claim is similar.

s. Regarding Claim 19, it has been analyzed and rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of Claim 2 above and because the scope of the claim is similar.

t. Regarding Claim 20, it has been analyzed and rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of Claim 4 above and because the scope of the claim is similar.

u. Regarding Claim 21, it has been analyzed and rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of Claim 6 above and because the scope of the claim is similar.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HUNTER B. LONSBERRY whose telephone number is (571)272-7298. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday during normal business hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John W. Miller can be reached on 571-272-7353. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/HUNTER B. LONSBERRY/  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2421

HBL